

REMARKS

In the last Office Action, the Examiner withdrew the rejection of claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103; objected to the Specification, rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and rejected claims 1, 3, 4, and 6-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first
5 paragraph.

By this amendment, Applicant provided proper antecedent basis for the limitations in claim 1 and clarified claims 1, 4, 7 and 8.

Objection to the Specification

10 Applicant has corrected the Specification as requested by the Examiner.
Therefore, this objection should be withdrawn.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Applicant has amended claim 1 so that proper antecedent basis is provided.
15 Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 4, and 6-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the
20 Examiner alleges that these claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention.

In order to further prosecution, Applicant has amended claims 1, 4, 7 and 8 to specify that the power splitter is connected to the antennae. This limitation does not

indicate that the power splitter has selecting capability. Rather, antennae impedance is adjusted by selectively connecting it to the power splitters. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully requests that this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 be entered by the Examiner, placing claims 1, 3, 4, and 6-8 in condition for allowance. Applicant submits that the proposed amendments of claims 1, 3, 4, and 6-8 do not raise new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner, since all of the elements and their relationships claimed were either earlier claimed or inherent in the claims as examined. Therefore, this Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully points out that the final action by the Examiner presented some new arguments as to the application of the art against Applicant's invention. It is respectfully submitted that the entering of the Amendment would allow the Applicant to reply to the final rejections and place the application in condition for allowance.

Finally, Applicant submits that the entry of the amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant submits that this claimed invention, as amended, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicant therefore requests the entry of this

Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 16, 2009
Reg. No. 52,418
Phone (505) 665-1595

By: /s/ Meredith H. Schoenfeld
Meredith H. Schoenfeld
Los Alamos National Laboratory
LC/IP, MS A187
Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545